

Applicant: Ari-Pekka Kautto et al.  
Application No.: 10/596,665  
Response to Office action mailed Jan. 6, 2010  
Response filed March 5, 2010

### Remarks

Claims 8–21 remain pending in the application. In the Office action dated Jan. 6, 2010, claims 8–21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Parni et al.* (WO 00/58555) in view of *Lintula et al.* (WO 00/63494).

Parni et al discloses a rod cradle where the rod contacting surfaces are coated with a group of hard materials having good sliding and self-lubricating properties; however the coating is extremely thin from 1 nm to 90 m [*sic* nm], page 5, line 31. As the examiner notes in the Office action “Parni is silent concerning the slider piece being of an insert-molded part of the cradle.”

*Lintula et al* specifically sets forth “The rod bed is manufactured such that *at least two parts are manufactured separately*, the shape of the parts being such that their longitudinal side or sides can be disposed together one within the other or partly one within the other, and the parts are fitted together to form an integrated rod bed.” (Emphasis added), page 6, lines 13–16.

The claims have been amended to more particularly clearly point out applicant’s invention, *insert-molded has been placed in the preamble* of the claims and breathes life and breath into the claims. The *materials claimed have been limited to plastics* based on the various materials listed in the specification, where the slider is specifically set forth as being “sintered thermoplastic or thermoset plastic, or molded from hard polyurethane by insert molding.” (¶ [0010]). The original PCT claims are not limited plastic, but the invention as disclosed is inherently limited to plastic by the descriptions of the materials given, and by the nature of the process insert-molding as described. Claim 8 has also been limited to “*a slider... which is permanently joined as an insert-molded part of the cradle*” following claim 15 “wherein the first molding and the second molding are joined permanently to each other”.

The claims as amended define over Parni et al and *Lintula et al* which do not show or suggest an insert-molded rod cradle composed of two plastic parts permanently joined by insert-molding.

Applicant notes that insert-molding is described by the specification in ¶ [0022] so as

Applicant: Ari-Pekka Kautto et al.  
Application No.: 10/596,665  
Response to Office action mailed Jan. 6, 2010  
Response filed March 5, 2010


to include what is sometimes known as over-molding, see "Overmolding Guide"  
<http://www.glstpes.com/pdf/om.pdf> pages 2, 3 and at the same time insert-molding, as  
described in ¶ [0009]. Therefore the term insert-molding as used in the claims incorporates  
the concept of over-molding.

Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance.

Favorable action thereon is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Patrick J.G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934  
Attorney for Applicant  
Stiennon & Stiennon  
P.O. Box 1667  
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1667  
(608) 250-4870  
Amdt2.res

March 5, 2010 (4:25pm)